

REMARKS

In the Official Action mailed on **15 September 2009**, Examiner reviewed claims 1, 4, 7, 10, 13, 16, and 19-29. Examiner rejected claims 1, 4, 7, 10, 13, and 20-25 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Balfanz et al.

(“*Talking to Strangers: Authentication in Ad-Hoc Wireless Networks*,” hereinafter “Balfanz”), in view of Hermann (EP 1,024,626, hereinafter “Hermann”), in view of Lowensohn et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 2004/0230809, hereinafter “Lowensohn”).

Examiner rejected claims 19, and 26-29 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Balfanz, in view of Hermann, in view of Lowensohn, and further in view of Applicant’s Admitted Prior Art.

Interview Summary

In an interview conducted on 11 December 2009, Applicant discussed amending the independent claims to clarify the resident alert device is inserted in a domicile for a resident covered by a **secure community alert system**.

Examiner indicated that the proposed amendment appeared to overcome the rejections of record.

Accordingly, Applicant has amended the independent claims to clarify that in embodiments of the present invention the resident alert device is inserted in a domicile for a resident covered by a secure community alert system to receive information from an emergency operation center. Applicant has cancelled claim 27 without prejudice. These amendments find support in paragraph [0119] of the instant application. No new matter was added.

None of Belfanz, Hermann, and Lowensohn disclose a resident alert device that is inserted in a domicile for a resident covered by a secure community alert system to receive information from an emergency operation center.

Furthermore, Applicant’s Admitted Prior Art (AAPA) only discloses a telephone

that can receive messages from an emergency operation center.¹ As disclosed in the instant application, the telephone is not part of a **secure** community alert system:

In addition, the telephone calling system is easy for criminals to abuse.²

As previously described, there exists a problem with current means for providing citizens with emergency warnings. These problems include the difficulty of reaching only a portion of the citizen base, and the **difficulty in making sure that the warning system is secure such that unsavory characters cannot use the system to annoy or harass citizens.**³

Hence, none of Belfanz, Hermann, Lowensohn, and AAPA disclose a resident alert device that is inserted in a domicile for a resident covered by a secure community alert system to receive information from an emergency operation center.

In contrast, in embodiments described in the instant application, the resident alert device is inserted in a domicile for a resident to receive information from an emergency operation center.⁴ In the described embodiments, the resident is covered by a **secure community alert system.**⁵ None of Belfanz, Hermann, Lowensohn, and AAPA disclose a resident alert device that is inserted in a domicile for a resident covered by a secure community alert system to receive information from an emergency operation center.

Hence, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1, 7, and 13, as presently amended are in condition for allowance. In addition, Applicant respectfully submits that dependent claims that depend upon these independent

1 see instant application, par. [0023]

2 see instant application, par. [0021]; emphasis added

3 see *id.*, par. [0117]; emphasis added

4 see instant application, par. [0119]

5 see *id.*

claims are for the same reasons in condition for allowance and for reasons of the unique combinations recited in these claims.

CONCLUSION

It is submitted that the application is presently in form for allowance.
Such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By /Shun Yao/
Shun Yao
Registration No. 59,242

Date: 14 December 2009

Shun Yao
Park, Vaughan & Fleming LLP
2820 Fifth Street
Davis, CA 95618-7759
Tel: (530) 759-1667
Fax: (530) 759-1665
Email: shun@parklegal.com